



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,644	07/20/2001	Andrew S. Kanter	0010-2	1841

7590 02/25/2005

Ernest D. Buff
Ernest D. Buff & Associates, LLC
245 South Street
Morristown, NJ 07960

EXAMINER

CARLSON, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/909,644

Applicant(s)

KANTER, ANDREW S.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Carlson

Art Unit

3622

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

RECEIVED

MAR 08 2005

GROUP 3600

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/3/02, 9/29/03.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 17-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claim 1 line 12, "on said database" should be replaced by --on said server--.
 - Claim 2 line 18, "provided" should be deleted.
 - Claims 17-19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Applicant cannot replace or remove existing limitations in parent claims. Applicant should further limit the features already present in those claims.
 - Claim 20, "method" should be replaced by --system--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3622

- Claim 1 line 7, there is no antecedent basis for "the browser".
- Claim 2, the connection speed should be described as a connection speed to the Internet server, for added clarity.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. **Claims 1, 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Landsman et al (US6687737).**

Regarding claim 1, Landsman et al teaches interstitial ads displayed to a user's browser from an Internet server. The ads are triggered based upon code in the web page content [col 10 lines 5-31]. The ads are described as being displayed in browser popup windows which are shown to the user for a specified period of time (i.e. the duration of the ads) and the popup window is then removed upon completion. Landsman et al teaches that the AdDescriptor file specifies whether the user is permitted to prematurely terminate (close) the ad displayed [32:5-46, fig 20]. This is taken to provide a temporary, non-dismissible ad window. Landsman et al also teaches that a log is kept regarding each ad impression [31:53-58]. Landsman et al also

teaches targeting ads based on stored user profiles [21:13-20] – this is taken to provide the registered user database and ad viewing history. When a user requests a subsequent webpage (via the user's ISP server(s)), the advertising display is triggered.

Regarding claims 5, 7, the ad display is programmed to be delayed until the user transitions to a subsequent page. Further, Landsman et al teaches ads that sleep for a predetermined time period before they are shown again [32:25-33].

Regarding claims 6, Landsman et al's plurality of ads to be shown and the ad queue are taken to provide a "series of ads" shown in an ad window.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landsman et al (US6687737).

Regarding claims 3, 4, Landsman et al teaches that the AdDescriptor file can specify the size and location of the ad window [fig 20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have displayed the window anywhere including the top of the user's screen or the middle of the user's screen as a design choice so that the ad is quite visible. A pop-up ad displayed to a central portion of a user's screen can be said to be "within" the browser window that visually surrounds it.

Regarding claim 9, Official Notice is taken that it is well known for an advertiser to collect email/postal mailing addresses (demographic info) of interested prospective customer so that they can deliver more information about their products, services, sales promotions, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided buttons on the advertiser's site in order to request more information be sent to them and to have fulfilled such requests via an email. The optionally claimed links need not be taught by the prior art.

Claims 8, 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landsman et al (US6687737) in view of Goldhaber et al (US5855008).

Regarding claims 10, Landsman et al does not teach compensation. Goldhaber et al teaches many embodiments whereby a registered computer user is compensated for viewing advertising [abstract]. The advertising can be targeted based on the registered user's demographics. The compensation can be routed to the user's registered account. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have registered and compensated the ad-viewing users of Landsman et al's system so that users may be motivated to and may benefit from viewing online ads.

Regarding claim 8, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided registration buttons and fillable forms/windows on the web site in order to collect registration information pursuant to Goldhaber et al's compensation. Goldhaber et al further discusses collection of personal (demographic) data at registration time.

Regarding claims 11, 15, 16, the ad display is programmed to be delayed until the user transitions to a subsequent page. Further, Landsman et al teaches ads that sleep for a predetermined time period before they are shown again [32:25-33].

Regarding claim 12, Landsman et al's plurality of ads to be shown and the ad queue are taken to provide a "series of ads" shown in an ad window.

Regarding claims 13, 14, Landsman et al teaches that the AdDescriptor file can specify the size and location of the ad window [fig 20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have displayed the window anywhere including the top of the user's screen or the middle of the user's screen as a design choice so that the ad is quite visible. A pop-up ad displayed to a central portion of a user's screen can be said to be "within" the browser window that visually surrounds it.

Regarding claim 17, Landsman et al also teaches targeting ads based on stored user profiles [21:13-20].

Claims 2, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landsman et al (US6687737) in view of Goldhaber et al (US5855008) and Radziewicz et al (US5854897).

Regarding 2, 18, 19, Radziewicz et al also teaches interstitial ads. Radziewicz et al teaches that the user's connection speed to the Internet can be measured and such connection speed or the user's terminal capabilities (heavy video/graphics, audio) can be used to select a particular format for the ads [11:7-28]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have specified various ad formats

in the AdDescriptor file so that the user can receive rich multimedia ads if their PC/connection could handle such files.

Regarding claim 20, Official Notice is taken that using a wireless connection in order to access the Internet is well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention for wireless users to have participated in the system Landsman et al so that they can enjoy the Internet wirelessly.

Conclusion

The examiner will have a new telephone number (571-272-6716) effective April 14, 2005. The examiner's old telephone number (703-308-3402) will remain active until June 14, 2005. Similarly, the telephone number for the examiner's supervisor (Eric Stamber) will change from 703-305-8469 to 571-272-6724.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 703-308-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6p, (off on alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jeffrey D. Carlson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

jdc

FORM PTO-1449 (Rev. 2-32)	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	ATTY. DOCKET NO: 0010-2	SERIAL NO.: 09/909,644
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT		APPLICANT: Andrew S. Kanter	
Use several sheets if necessary)		FILING DATE: July 20, 2001	GROUP: 2162

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
<i>JK</i>	6,044,376	03/28/00	Kurtzman, II	707	102	04-24-97

RECEIVED
OCT 01 2003
Technology Center 2100

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

							TRANSLATION	
	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	PATENTEE OR APPLICANT	CLASS	SUBCLASS		YES	NO

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)

EXAMINER

Jeff Carlson

DATE CONSIDERED

2/22/05

Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

RECEIVED

OCT 02 2003

GROUP 3600

FORM PTO-1449 (Rev. 2-32)		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE		ATTY. DOCKET NO: 0010-2		SERIAL NO.: 09/909,644		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT (Use several sheets if necessary)				APPLICANT: Andrew S. Kanter				
				FILING DATE: July 20, 2001		GROUP: 2162		
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS								
EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
JC		5,105,184	04/14/92	Pirani et al.	340	721	11-09-89	
		5,572,643	11/05/96	Judson	395	793	10-19-95	
		5,737,619	04/07/98	Judson	395	761	09-09-96	
		5,781,894	07/14/98	Petrecca et al.	705	14	08-11-95	
		5,848,397	12/08/98	Marsh et al.	705	14	04-19-96	
		5,933,811	08/03/99	Angles et al.	705	14	08-20-96	
		5,937,392	08/10/99	Alberts	705	14	07-28-97	
		5,946,664	08/31/99	Ebisawa	705	14	06-27-96	
		5,948,061	09/07/99	Merriman et al.	709	219	10-29-96	
		5,999,912	12/07/99	Wodarz et al.	705	14	05-01-97	
JC		6,009,409	12/28/99	Adler et al.	705	14	04-02-97	
FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS								
							TRANSLATION	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	PATENTEE OR APPLICANT	CLASS	SUBCLASS	YES	NO
OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)								
JC			"AOL, Anytime, Anywhere". Available at http://www.aol.com , June 23, 2000.					
JC			"Push PointCast". Available at http://www.webopedia.com , Apr. 7, 2000.					
JC			"Why Search, EntryPoint Delivers!". Available at http://www.entrypoint.com , Apr. 7, 2000.					
JC			Unicast, "Unicast Marks One-Year Anniversary Of Superstitial™ Ad Format With The Release Of New Version, 3.0", PR Newswire, Apr. 26, 2000, 4 pages.					
EXAMINER Jeff Calton				DATE CONSIDERED 2/22/05				
Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.								

(Form PTO 1449 [8-4])

RECEIVED
JUN 12 2002
GROUP 3600

Notice of References Cited

Application/Control No.

09/909,644

Applicant(s)/Patent Under

Reexamination

KANTER, ANDREW S.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Carlson

Art Unit

3622

Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,687,737	02-2004	Landsman et al.	709/203
	B	US-5,855,008	12-1998	Goldhaber et al.	705/14
	C	US-5,854,897	12-1998	Radziewicz et al.	709/224
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.